Exclusive: The New Walter Bill to Deprive Radicals of The Right to Travel, Page 3.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 12 MARCH 26, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Stalin's Exposure Is Communism's Self-Exposure

In The Muddy Wake of The Moscow Melodrama

Always resolutely non-conformist, we are preparing to make our own Stalin awards this year. We are conferring the prize for understatement on William Z. Foster for his delicate comment in the *Daily Worker* of March 16. Mr. Foster ventured to assert that Stalin was guilty of "incorrect methods of work." This was bold indeed.

Our Stalin prize for the most bewildering historical analogy of the year goes to the Alsop brothers. They concluded their column of March 19 on "The End of Stalin" by comparing Krushchev with Marcus Aurelius. Even an editor of *Pravda* would hesitate blushingly before going that far.

Of course, the Alsops did not mean this as adulation. "Of course," they wrote indignantly, "the Soviet has changed. So did Rome change when . . . Vespasian won Nero's purple. The good emperors were certainly better than the bad emperors. But alas they were not better for Rome's neighbors." (Presumably the Alsops think it would have been better if the barbarians had been allowed to engulf Rome several centuries earlier.) Even the best of those better Emperors, Marcus Aurelius, wrote his Meditations "in the field," the Alsops pointed out, "and the Romanians of our own day owe the language they still speak to the philosopher-emperor's career as a stern conqueror." (Would the Alsops rather the Romanians spoke their original Slavic dialect like the Bulgarians?) Dizzily high up on the scaffolding of their new world history, the Alsops concluded, "Krushchev is no philosopher ruler, but once again the parallel fits." Try hard as we can, the only *fits* we can see are those fits of historical parallelism which sometimes seize journalists.

Our better columnists are not alone in being haunted by the fear that the Soviets may really be reforming. If the Russians don't stop fraternizing with visiting Baptists, it's going to be hard to get the foreign aid bill through Congress. In his foreign aid message Mr. Eisenhower did indeed say that "the new turns and developments of Soviet policy" demonstrated "the success of our mutual security programs" but hastened to assure our lawmakers that Soviet leaders have not abandoned "their sinister designs." If Moscow wants peaceful co-existence with Washington, it could adopt no better way to demonstrate its sincerity than by obliging us each spring at budget time with a few "sinister designs" in full view of Capitol Hill like those Soviet submarines the Navy sights offshore whenever Congress begins to get economical. We can visualize a gentlemen's agreement arranging in return for a few of those "weather testing" flights over Moscow if the Soviet Congress ever gets to the point of acting up over *their* defense and foreign aid budgets. Bulganin was wrong to offer a friendship pact. What we need is a 20-year mutual menace pact.

Was Stalin Killed By His Own Comrades?

The mystery in Moscow is why the new top leadership has gone so much further than seems necessary in its attacks on Stalin. It is possible that Stalin's name is being so thoroughly blackened in order to prepare the public for a new revelation—that his own comrades were forced to liquidate the dictator to save themselves and Russia.

Notice that in his address of February 25, Krushchev is reported to have told the Communist Party Congress that toward the end of his life Stalin considered Marshal Voroshilov a British spy and barred him from the Politbureau. Molotov was placed under house arrest and, according to these reports, Stalin planned to get rid of Molotov, Krushchev and others "in the immediate future."

These leaders knew, then, that they were doomed. Were they prepared to meet their fate without resistance? Was it only the happy coincidence that Stalin died at that point which saved the top leadership from a new blood purge? Or did they in desperation decide to remove the old monster (as they now paint him)? Is this revelation to be the climax of the Moscow melodrama?

The State Department and the White House are not the only branches of government discomfited by the new developments in Moscow. They also create difficulties for the FBI. Krushchev's revelation that Stalin was a bloody old tyrant, suspicious to the point of madness, may not lead to the liquidation of foreign Communist parties but must strike them an irreparable blow. Their members may be devoted, but they certainly are exposed as knuckle-heads taught to believe and obey whatever lies they were told from Moscow. (See for example the naive plaint of Alan Max, the *Daily Worker's* managing editor, "We went overboard . . . in denying any suggestion that civil liberties were not being firmly respected in the Soviet Union.") Stalin's exposure is Communism's self-exposure and the lessons are (1) that Russia is too backward a country to provide leadership elsewhere, (2) that the slavish conformity of the Communist parties to Moscow has stultified a whole generation of radical leadership, and (3) it is time for the Left to break away from all Communist influence and strike out on a new path determined in each country by its own conditions and traditions. The liquidation of the Communist

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hopeful Testimony on Disarmament Most of the Press Ignored

Defense Secretary Wilson Optimistic About Arms Agreement With Russia

Because most of the press ignored and no paper reported fully Secretary Wilson's testimony on disarmament before the Senate's Humphrey subcommittee on March 15, we are here making the salient portions available verbatim. They indicate that despite the general reluctance of the U.S. government to enter into any real agreement for arms reduction as contrasted with arms inspection, there are powerful figures in the Cabinet who take a more hopeful view. We believe Mr. Wilson's testimony deserves wide circulation, and confirms what we have long reported—that the Secretary of Defense is a friend of peace.

SENATOR SYMINGTON. Do you believe that our chances for a successful disarmament result are better if we are stronger than the Communists, or do you feel that that is not important to the disarmament negotiations?

SECRETARY WILSON. . . . I would think the chances of realistic discussion and progress in it would be greater if both parties felt they were dealing from strength. . . .

The men in this room will remember . . . in the early and middle thirties, we had a different situation in our country in the rise of our labor movement, and a new conception of how labor should be treated.

Sees A Parallel in Labor Relations

We started out with the sitdown strikes in the automotive industry; and at that time very few people would have been willing to bet that 15 years later the relations between the management and the unions would have been so improved that we achieved a five-year agreement; and we did not make much progress until, No. 1, we were willing to talk to them and, No. 2, we realized the position that labor had and that they could operate from strength and force, and that we were (sic) parties, and either could precipitate a disastrous strike or we could get together and work for the good of the people and for our respective unions, management, and the workmen themselves.

Must Define Our Common Objectives

Perhaps one reason, in a peculiar kind of a way, I am a little more optimistic than some other people, may be because in a peculiar kind of a way they are the same kind of problems, and you have to first talk about it, you have to define your common objectives, and let your differences slide off into the background, instead of accentuating your differences and forgetting that you have many things worth while in common.

And I happen to think that the mass of the people in Russia do not want a war any more than the mass of Americans want a war, and they hope and pray that their respective leaders on both sides will be smart enough and imaginative enough to find some way of averting that disastrous war.

SENATOR SYMINGTON. [evading the point] Then as I understand it from your answer, you believe that it is a good idea to negotiate from a position of relative strength, if possible, instead of one of relative weakness, is that right?

SECRETARY WILSON. That is correct. . . .

SENATOR BARKLEY. In regard to the effectiveness of this aerial inspection, I think it has been conceded by all the witnesses who have testified here on the subject, that up to now there has been no device invented or is now in sight which would enable any or either nation to inspect with any degree of accuracy what is underground. . . .

"There's Always A Hole"

SECRETARY WILSON. You know most things that are underground, there is a hole that you can get to it.

SENATOR BARKLEY. But . . . certainly in a vast country like Russia and a country like China, unless there was some sort of perpetual inspection, which probably would be impossible to get agreement on, there might be vast areas in those countries where they could engage in a massive movement of concealment by putting their materials underground, and we could not detect them by any form of aerial inspection now in existence, is that true?

It's The Attitude That Counts

SECRETARY WILSON. If I may say so, Senator, I think you have overstated the thing a little bit. The real problem is one of attitudes as between the parties.

SENATOR BARKLEY. I did not get that.

SECRETARY WILSON. I say, the big problem, finally is one of attitude between the parties. If the parties are really trying to carry out the agreement, and you have sufficient inspection to audit it, you can tell whether, without doing it to perfection, just like auditing the financial activities of a big corporation, you can pretty well tell whether there are any crooks in the place or not.

Somebody may do a little local stealing once in a while, but you can tell whether the thing is being run right or not. . . .

Russia To Be Great Industrial Power

I was trying to make the point a while ago, when I was talking about negotiating from strength on both sides, that there is no way that I can see that we can keep the Russians from having great industrial power within a reasonable number of years. They have the resources in their country, they have the population, they have the ambition.

And while certainly we must keep equal or ahead of the Russians in all this new development and in our military power, we must keep ahead until some kind of an understanding can be worked out. We might as well recognize now that they are going to have. . . . great military and industrial power some day, and that we could well afford, in all our discussions with them, to recognize a relative equality of power, potentially, even if it may not exist today, and not try to put on the Russians or the rest of the world any kind of a position that is in any sense dominated by the fact that we have this superior military power. In my opinion, if we try that, we would not make much headway with it. . . .

Bigger and bigger military power, in my opinion, is not the solution for the problems of the world. It is a necessity for our country, while the present situation exists, to maintain this strength, and keep ahead; but if we overdo it, we will not accomplish the purpose we are starting out to achieve, and that is, establish a condition of peace in the world. . . .

How Arms Races Lead to War

I happen to think, also, that the less the burden of armaments on peoples like the Russians and ourselves, the less the likelihood of war. . . .

If we go into an all-out armaments race between the Russians and ourselves, putting a bigger and bigger percentage of the productive effort of the country into preparation for war as against the peacetime pursuits (sic) being the standard of living of the respective peoples, and you carry that on out to an extreme, you will have the people so heated up in one way or another, or in their country, what has happened in the past history of the world might happen again—they will engage in a foreign war to try to maintain the hold of the people of either country, to make them stand for the big sacrifices involved in a tremendous armaments race. . . .

I do not happen to go on the basis of trying to work out something by accusing the other party of bad faith. I would not start out on that basis. But I would try to establish a system so we could establish his good faith.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unnoticed by the Press, Walter Launches A Weird Theory and A New Anti-Travel Bill

A Conspiracy to Apply for Passports In The Hope of Being Rejected?

A most extraordinary gap in Washington coverage was the failure of the press generally to notice Congressman Walter's new bill to give the State Department statutory authority to deny passports on political grounds and to refuse passport applicants the right to confront their accusers.

Overwrought seems to be the charitable way to describe the strange theory of passport cases expounded by Congressman Walter in introducing the bill on March 14. "More and more Communists and people under Communist discipline," he told the House, "apply for passports knowing full well that the Secretary of State has the right—the duty rather—to deny their applications. After denial, they take their cases to court in order to break the doors to the secret files. There they want to find names of those who keep an eye on their activities."

"The success of the Communist plan," he went on, "has been greatly enhanced by some of the court decisions, holding that when the Secretary of State refuses to issue a passport to a Communist, he must disclose to the applicant the source of information which caused the refusal."

The fact is, of course, that in no case has the State Department yet given a passport applicant that "quasi-judicial hearing" ordered in the Otto Nathan case, or that right to confront accusers ordered by Judge Youngdahl in the Leonard Boudin passport litigation. The Department has either granted the passport or appealed the decision.

A Strange 'Day in Court'

To combat this supposed conspiracy to apply for passports in the hope of being rejected, Mr. Walter introduced HR 9991. The purpose of the bill, as Mr. Walter explained it, was to give every citizen applying for a passport "his day in court." The bill provides for a strange kind of "court."

The applicant need not be fully informed of the charges against him; he would not get a chance to confront and cross-examine hostile witnesses; the hearings officer is directed to use confidential information. "Proceedings," the bill says, "shall be conducted in such manner as to protect from disclosure all information affecting the national security, safety and public interest or the disclosure of investigative sources or investigative methods."

The ultimate irony about these rules is that this part of the bill is presented as an amendment to the Administrative Procedures Act. As our lawyer readers will remember, this Act, originally the Walter-Logan bill, was passed in 1946 as the result of a long campaign by Congressman Walter to guarantee business interests full and fair hearings before New Deal regulatory agencies.

The Administrative Procedure Act provides that in hearings before all administrative agencies and regulatory bodies, "Every party shall have the right to present his case or defense by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts."

Peculiar Precedent

Mr. Walter told the House his bill was "partially patterned on a procedure spelled out in section 235 (c) and section 242 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the latter fully sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in Carlos Marcello v. John M. Bonds *(350 U.S. 856)*."

It is the former, not the latter, however, which is in point here. Section 235 (c) of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is the only statutory provision on the law books of this country which permits the use of undisclosed "confidential" information in a hearing. Even the McCarran-Walter Act did not dare apply this to deportation cases. It applies only to "exclusion" cases, i.e. cases of aliens who have not yet been legally admitted to this country and who as non-residents are not yet covered by the basic constitutional guaranties which otherwise protect citizen and alien alike.

The second part of the bill would amend the Communist Control Act of 1954 and add to it the present State Department provisions denying passports not only to Communists but also to others "regardless of the formal state of [their] affiliation with the Communist party" who may be going abroad to "advance the cause of the Communist movement." The bill incorporates verbatim the notoriously vague and sweeping Departmental passport regulation 51.135.

The Walter bill reflects the fear of the State Department and the FBI that the pending Robeson and Boudin passport appeals may force quasi-judicial hearings in which applicants will have the right fully to know the charges against them and to cross-examine hostile witnesses. Congress, of course, cannot constitutionally change the historic meaning of the due process clause to fit the Department's desire for star chamber hearings.

There is grave danger, however, that this bill might slip through without hearings. Only the rightist press has paid attention to it—the *Chicago Tribune* in a long story on March 16, the *New York Journal-American* in an approving editorial on March 19. Elsewhere we have seen the story only in a buried paragraph on page 47 of the *New York Post* on March 16 and in a one-paragraph United Press dispatch on page 41 of the *New York Times* which was so inaccurate that it did not even mention passports.

"Too Many ADA'ers On The Bench"

Testimony released by the House Appropriations Committee the day after Congressman Walter's speech on passports disclosed (1) his claim that he was responsible for the rehearing before the full Court of Appeals bench here of the Watkins contempt decision by Judges Edgerton and Bazelon and (2) that he looks forward to a "last great day" of settlement with such "personalities"—whom he calls ADA-ers. Mr. Walter was testifying as a member of the Commission on Government Security and was being questioned by Congressman Andrews of Alabama (p. 47, 2d Sup. Approp. Bill, 1956):

MR. ANDREWS. It seems like it is impossible to get convictions of witnesses who refuse to answer questions when they appear before congressional committees.

MR. WALTER. I think that is because so many members of the ADA are on the bench.

MR. ANDREWS. The Americans for Democratic Action?

MR. WALTER. Yes. The trouble is certain Circuit Courts of Appeal lean over backwards to reverse convictions. It is such an outrageous thing that the Department of Justice on the insistence of your humble servant insisted on presenting a matter to a full court to review a decision. I invite you to look at the background of the two judges that set aside this conviction.

MR. ANDREWS. Off the record.

(Discussion Off The Record).

MR. WALTER. Of course, we are going very far afield and you cannot deal with personalities such as we are compelled to deal with until the last great day.

The ADA's Washington representative, Edward D. Hollander, characterized this as an attempt by Walter to "bully" judges. Walter counter-attacked on March 20 by "exposing" Mr. Hollander as a one-time member of the long defunct Washington Bookshop.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time to Recognize That Russian Puppet Parties Are Incompatible with Co-Existence

When Stalin Growled, Krushchev Danced The *Gopak*

(*Continued from Page One*)

movement in the West would destroy a tattered scarecrow which reaction exploits everywhere; it is incompatible with co-existence for Russia to manipulate puppet parties in other countries. The Communists stand exposed as prize idiots abroad and prize cowards within Russia; the hierarchy knew what was going on but dared not speak up. When Stalin growled, Krushchev danced the *gopak*. The intellectuals of the outside world must continue to approach the great revolution of our time with sympathy but also with critical detachment and not with party line subservience. These are not lessons that Communists are capable of learning. They have lost the habit of independent thinking.

Our heart bleeds for the FBI in this turmoil. Last year J. Edgar Hoover was complaining to the House Appropriations Committee that it was more difficult to watch the Communists because they were going underground. This year he complains that his tasks are becoming harder because they are reducing "the size of the underground operations . . . by reason of the general political atmosphere created as a result of the Geneva conference." (Good thing that fellow Eisenhower is not a Democrat or they'd have him up on loyalty proceedings for his "associations" at Geneva). But even if the Communists do fade away in the muddy backwash of Moscow's abandonment of "Stalinism," the FBI need not fear unemployment. Mr. Hoover's definition of "pseudoliberals" is broad enough to give him an excuse to eavesdrop on half the country. The FBI Chief told the Appropriations Committee "pseudoliberals" were "individuals who are not members of the Communist party and who quite vociferously deny any sympathy with Communism but who . . . oppose security programs and sponsor liberalizing security measures . . . they advance the theory that the menace of communism is a mere myth or hysteria," in short, to disagree with the FBI is to demonstrate disloyalty.

Like our British cousins, we cannot understand the American government's failure to show complete solidarity with London on the problem of Cyprus. The ouster of ten families and twenty shopkeepers from their homes and shops in the heart of Nicosia as punishment for refusal to inform on their fellow Cypriotes should not be unfamiliar to Washington. Unwillingness to inform has for many months been punished here by loss of government employment, denial of passports, and widespread blacklisting in the entertainment business, newspaper work, teaching, maritime jobs and other businesses. The day the British resorted to expulsions on Cyprus was the day a Federal judge in Washington found a Cornell University zoology professor, Marcus Singer, guilty of contempt for refusing to name others before the House Un-American Activities Committee after admitting that he himself had once been a Communist. Lloyd Barenblatt, a former instructor at Vassar, was sentenced to six months in jail in a similar case the day before. What was imposed on Cyprus as an emergency measure has become a matter of course here.

We must leave until next week an assessment of the Kefauver victory in Minnesota and the danger that the two best Democratic candidates may defeat each other and open the door to a Harriman or a Symington.

A Story About General Robert E. Lee With A Moral for Today's South

Readers will recall that what most depressed us about Miss Lucy's treatment at Tuscaloosa was not the mob but that there was not one student with the moral courage to get up and sit beside her on that lonely front bench.

The other night, reading up on the history of the South and Reconstruction, we came across a story of quite a different sort about Robert E. Lee.

It happened in that first terrible year after the South's final defeat. A Negro, emboldened by emancipation, dared walk into one of Richmond's most fashionable churches, push his way to the communion altar and kneel before it.

The congregation was startled. What happened next was determined by one white man's nobility. That man was General Lee. He rose from his pew, walked forward to the altar and knelt in prayer beside the Negro. The congregation followed his lead.

We wish someone would get the President to tell this story at press conference as a lesson for the South of today. Its greatest hero never showed his greatness more clearly than when he knelt in Christian fraternity beside the human symbol of his own defeat. We can see that the South is not wrong in worshipping Robert E. Lee's memory; the pity is only that it does not follow his example.

Jennings Perry Will Do A First Hand Portrait of Kefauver in Next Week's Issue

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:
3/26/56

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED